

RESPONSE

In the Office Action mailed May 5, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 1-34 under 35 USC Section 102(e) as being anticipated by Saleh et al. In view of the following comments, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed, and reconsideration of the claims as presented herein is respectfully requested.

In Saleh, a command or message is sent requesting that the network determine the position of the device. However, Saleh fails to disclose receipt of a location command, or a client receiving location information in a token. Saleh does not show or suggest insertion of location information in a token. Additionally, Saleh fails to disclose incremental insertion of information in a location token.

According to a first aspect of the present invention, a token is transmitted for a client device. According to another aspect of the invention, the token is populated as it moves through the network (generally from the client or server to the server or client). According to another aspect of the invention, there is flexibility to determine location using capabilities of network components and devices in the path of the request. According to still another aspect, the token moves through the network and values get updated at any intermediary nodes. According to one other aspect of the present invention, a signature which is an authentication mechanism is employed. According to yet another aspect of the invention, the location token goes all the way to the client. Saleh is devoid of the basic structure of the claims, and neither anticipates nor suggests the claimed invention, and therefore does not render the claims unpatentable.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance and a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

Respectfully Submitted

Jano, Bashar et al.

BY: 

Randall S. Vaas

Registration No. 34,479

Phone (847) 523-2327

Fax. No. (847) 523-2350